A Fourth LETTER,

Concerning the

Sacred Trinity;

IN

REPLY

To what is Entituled,

An ANSWER,

TO

Dr *WALLIS*'s Three Letters.

By *JOHN WALLIS*, D. D.

LONDON:
Printed for *Tho. Parkhurst*, at the *Bible* and *Three Crowns*, in *Cheapside*, 1691.

UMI

A

Fourth LETTER

Concerning the

Sacred Trinity;

IN

REPLY

To what is Intended

An ANSWER

TO

Dr. WALLIS's Three Letters.

By JOHN WELLS, D.D.

LONDON:

Printed for Tho. Parkhurst, at the Bible and Three Crowns in Cheapside. 1695.

A Fourth LETTER, Concerning the Sacred Trinity.

SIR,

IN a former Answer (from I know not whom) to my First and Second Letter; we had *Two Persons* (a *Friend* and his *Neighbour*) in *One Man*. Of which I have given account in my Third Letter. We have now an Answer to that also. But whether from the *Friend*, or the *Neighbour*, or from a *Third Person*, he doth not tell me. Yet all the *Three Persons*, may (for ought I know) be the *same Man*.

However, whether it be, or be not, the same *Man*, it is not amiss for him to act a Third *Person* (as of an *Adversary*), as being thereby not obliged to insist upon, and maintain what was before said; but may fairly decline it if he please.

The one may Grant what the other Denies, and Deny what the other Grants: And ſtill, as the *Scene* changes, the *Man* may Act another *Perſon*. And ſo I find it is. As for inſtance:

The former Anſwerer, takes it *unkindly*, and would have it thought a *Calumny*, that I charged it on ſome of the *Socinians*, That *How clear ſoever the Expreſſions of Scripture be for our purpoſe, they will not believe it, as being Inconſiſtent with natural Reaſon: And though they do not think fit to give us a bare-faced Rejection of Scripture, yet they do (and muſt, they tell us) put ſuch a Forced Senſe on the words, as to make them ſignify ſomewhat elſe.* Therefore, to ſhew that this is not a *Calumny*, but a clear *Truth*, I cited their own Words, and quoted the Places where they are to be found, wherein themſelves ſay the ſame things, in as full Expreſſions as any that I had charged them with; *That every one is to interpret the Scripture according to his own ſenſe; and what ſo ſeems grateful to him, he is to imbrace and maintain, though the whole World be againſt it: That he is not to heed what Men teach or think, or have at any time taught or thought, whoever they be, or have been, or how many ſoever: That though, even in the ſacred Monuments, it be found written, not Once only, but Many times; he ſhould not yet for all that believe it ſo to be: That what plainly appears cannot be* (or, as was before

fore explained, what *He thinks ſo*, though all the World beſide think otherwiſe,) *is not to be admitted; even though in the ſacred Oracles it appear to be Expreſly affirmed*: *But thoſe ſacred Words are to be interpreted, (though it be by Unuſual Ways or Tropes,) to ſome other Senſe than what they ſpeak*: *That (becauſe it ſeems to him abſurd) he muſt (with* Auguſtine's *good leave, and of the reſt who think as he doth) put a Force (how great ſoever) upon* Paul's *words, rather than to admit ſuch Senſe. That, if our Reaſon dictate to us ought otherwiſe than the Scripture doth; it is an Errour to ſay, That in ſuch caſe we are rather to believe the Scripture.* Now our new Anſwerer (though he would ſtill have it to be a *Calumny*) ſhuffles it off with this, *He is not concerned, that* Socinus, *or any other Author, has dropt imprudent words,* and *leaves it to the* Socinian to anſwer, *pag.* 10. (for he is now to act the *Arian, pag.* 11, 12, 14, 16, 17.) This point therefore I look upon as yielded; concerning the ſlight opinion which (ſome of) the *Socinians* have of *Scripture*, in competition with *Humane Reaſon.*

Again; when I had ſpoken of our *Immortal Soul*, in its *ſeparate Exiſtence* after Death, as of an *Intellectual Being*; (but, with an *I F at leſt thoſe who deny the Bleſſed Trinity will allow that there are ſuch Beings*:) To ſhew the *ſuſpicion* intimated, was

not

not groundleſs; I cited *Socinus*'s own words, where he expreſly tells us, that *the Soul after death doth not ſubſiſt; nor doth ſo Live as to be then in a capacity of being Rewarded or Puniſhed*, (that is, in effect, It is no more Alive, than is the Dead Body, not ſenſible of pain or pleaſure.) Which I think is ground enough for ſuch a *ſuſpicion*, without being *uncharitable*. Nor doth this new Anſwerer clear *Socinus*, or *himſelf*, from this ſuſpicion. Onely tells us (*pag.* 10.) it is an *Inſinuation*, as if *they believe not Angels*. Which is nothing to the purpoſe of *the Soul's ſeparate Exiſtence*, (which is that I inſiſted on) nor doth he ſo much as tell us, that *he doth believe Angels* (much leſs that he doth believe the Souls ſeparate Exiſtence,) ſo that the ground of ſuſpicion ſtill remains. I had ſhewed him how different *Socinus*'s Opinion is, from that of St. *Paul*; when he *deſired to be diſſolved*, or *to depart hence*, and *to be with Chriſt*, as *much better* for him, than to *abide in the fleſh*, Phil. 1. 23, 24. And, *to be abſent from the Body* (which muſt be after Death, and before the Reſurrection) *and to be preſent with the Lord*, 2 Cor. 5. 8. And this new Anſwerer, though he takes notice of the charge, doth not ſo much as tell us, that he is not of *Socinus*'s Opinion herein. Which (if it be ſo) he might reaſonably have told us upon this occaſion.

ſion. I might have added that of Chriſt, *Mat.* 10.28. *Fear not thoſe who kill the Body, but are not able to kill the Soul*: Whereas, if the Soul after Death be as inſenſible as the Body, That is as much killed as This. And that of Chriſt to the Converted Thief on the Croſs, *Luk.* 23.43. *This day ſhalt thou be with me in Paradiſe.* For ſurely by *Paradiſe* he did not mean *Purgatory*; nor yet, that he ſhould be *with him in Hell, amongſt the Devils and the Damned*; nor that his *Soul* ſhould be in a condition as *ſenſeleſs* as his Body: For *Paradiſe* doth not ſound like any of theſe. I might have added alſo that of *Lazarus* and the *Rich Glutton*, Luk. 16. 23, 24, 25, 28. For though *Parables* are not ſtrongly Argumentative, as to all the Punctilio's of them; yet, as to the main ſcope of them, they are: (elſe, to what purpoſe are they uſed.) Now here we have that *Glutton* repreſented as *Tormented in Hell*, and *Lazarus* at *Reſt* in *Abraham's Boſom*; and there *Comforted*, while the other is *Tormented*: And all this, while yet he had *Brethren upon Earth*, to whom he deſires *Lazarus* might be *ſent*. All which is not agreeable to *a condition not capable of reward or puniſhment*. And upon the whole, we have reaſon to ſuſpect, that *Socinians* may have ſome other odd Tenents, which they think fit rather to *conceal*,

ceal, than to *Deny*. So that I look upon this point as gained alſo; That *Socinus* (uncontrouled by this Anſwerer) doth deny the ſubſiſtence of the *Soul* after Death, as then capable of Reward or Puniſhment.

Another point which I look upon as granted, is concerning that place, *Joh.* 1. *In the beginning was the Word*; *and the Word was with God*; *and the Word was God*; *and the Word was made fleſh*, *and dwelt amongſt us*. Concerning this place, we were come to this Iſſue with our former Anſwerer, (at his *p.* 9.) If by *Word* be meant a *Perſon*, (*pre-exiſtent* to Chriſts Incarnation by the Virgin *Mary*;) and, by *God*, be meant the *True God*, or *God Almighty*; then *this place is to our purpoſe*; for elſe (he tells us) *St. John writes Non-ſenſe*. Now, that *St. John writes Non-ſenſe*, I ſuppoſe he will not ſay (whatever he thinks) becauſe he pretends a great Reverence for Scriptures (and doth not take it kindly that I ſhould ſuſpect the contrary.) Whether of the other two points he would ſtick to, he did not think fit to tell us; For indeed his buſineſs was not to tell us what he would have, but what he would not have; and concludes nothing thereupon, but that *the place is obſcure* (he knows not how to make it ſerve his turn;) and (that it may ſo ſeem)

seem) he indeavours to cast what dust he can into the Spring; and then to say, The Water is not *clear*. I have given him my Reasons (and I think they be cogent) why I judge the place *clear* enough, as to both points. And should I admit (as I think I may) that, by *Word*, is meant somewhat else (as he tells us) *in forty other places*: this is nothing to the purpose. For we are not here enquiring, what by the word *Logos* is meant in *Aristotle*, or what in *Plato*, or what in *forty other places*; but what is meant, by *the Word*, in This place: Nor what, by *Gods*, is meant in *Psal.* 82. 6, 7. *I have said ye are Gods, but ye shall die like Men*; But what by God is *here* meant, where it is said, *The Word was with God, and the Word was God.* Nor is here any need of a *Rhetorick Lecture*, to inquire, by what *Trope*, or *Figure*, or with what *Allusion*, Christ is here called *The Word*; It is enough that 'tis *Christ* who is here so called. And, after all his toil, I do not find, that himself hath the confidence to Deny (though he doth not think fit to grant it) but that here, by *the Word*, is meant *Christ*; and that *God* here mentioned, is *God Almighty*; and consequently, If St. *John* do not *write Non-sense* (as he is pleased to phrase it) *the place is to our purpose.* Now our new Answerer, seems to me, to quit the first of these points; and chooseth rather to act the *A-*

 rian,

rian, than the *Socinian*, as taking that to be more defensible, *pag.* 11, 14, 17. And doth admit that, by *the Word* here, is meant the Person of *Christ*; and *pre-existent* to his *Incarnation*; as by whom *the World was made*, at least as by *an Instrument*; and doth allow him to be *God*, though not the *same* God; but that *the Father* and *the Word* are *Two Gods*; (*p.* 17.) and can allow him the Character of *Being over all, God blessed for ever*; and can so *be as liberal of the Title of God, to Christ, as any Trinitarian whatever*; p. 16. So that now the dispute is reduced to this; When it is said, *The Word* (meaning *Christ*) *was with God, and the Word was God*; whether by *God*, be meant the *True* God, *God Almighty*. Of which we are to say more anon.

Another grant we have, *pag.* 3. where he doth admit, that *a thing may be* Unum *and* Tres (*One and Three*) *in several respects*: And that *'Tis true indeed, he cannot say, that there is a Contradiction in holding, that there may be Three Persons in God.* And, in granting this, he grants what I undertook to prove. For he knows very well, that the business which I undertook, was not, to discourse the whole Controversy at large; but so stated the question, as to confine it *to this single Point*, Whether it be an *Impossibility*, or *Inconsistence with Reason*, that there may be *Three somewhats* (which we

we call *Persons*) which are but *One God*? And when he grants me, that there is in it no *Contradiction*, or *Inconsistence with Reason*; all the rest is beside the Question. I know very well, that both this and the former Answerer have made it their business to change the state of the Question: And if what I bring to prove what I undertake, do not prove the task they set me; they glory as if they had the better. But the Lawyers tell us, that, when Issue is once joined; if we prove the thing in Issue, we carry the Cause; and what is more than so, is over and above, or to spare. And a Mathematician, if he prove what he proposeth, concludes with *quod erat demonstrandum*, (*he hath proved what he undertook to prove*;) if he prove more than so; 'tis more than he was obliged to do. And if a Logician prove (*propositionem negatam*) the Proposition which is incumbent on him to prove, he hath done his work; and if he prove more than so, it is more than he need to do. And accordingly, when this Answerer doth acknowledge that I have proved what I undertake to prove, (that there is no *Impossibility*, there is no *Contradiction*, nor *Inconsistence with Reason*, that *Three somewhats* may be *One God*) he ought to acquiesce therein, and acknowledge that I have done my Work. For when the Controversy was divided into two Branches,

Whether the thing be *True*, and whether it be *Possible*; and it was the latter of the two that I undertook: If I have shewed, *It is not impossible*, (which this Answerer doth grant that I have done,) I have done the work that I undertook. And if this be once agreed, it goes a great way as to the other Branch, That the thing is *True*. For I find the last Result of our Adversaries, (when they are close pressed,) is commonly this, It is *Impossible*, It is *Absurd*, It is *Non-sense*, It is *Inconsistent with Reason*, and therefore it cannot be *True*. And that therefore a *Force*, *no matter how great*, must be put upon the Words which do, how *expresly soever*, *affirm it* (to make them signify somewhat else than what they *plainly do signify*) then to admit it. And if I have (as is now confessed) destroyed this last Reserve, let them press this point no more. Or, if they will retract this grant, let the next Answerer keep to this point, to prove it *Impossible*, or *Inconsistent with Reason*, and not ramble out into other discourses, which are nothing to the purpose of what I proposed to prove.

Amongst his other Concessions, I shall reckon that in *pag.* 14. where he argues from *Joh.* 16. 13. That there is between *the Father*, *Son*, *and Holy Ghost*, a Distinction so great, as that they may not unfitly be called *Three Persons* (where I observe

observe also, that he owns the *Personality* of the *Holy-Ghost*, as of the *Father*, and of the *Son*. 'Tis true indeed, he seems to make the Distinction between them, Greater than I do. But I thus far agree with him, That there is, *in Truth*, a *Distinction*; and that more than *Imaginary*, or what depends only upon our Imagination; and Greater than that of what we call the *Divine Attributes*. And therefore we reckon the *Persons* to be but *Three*; but the *Attributes* to be *more*. And we do admit, amongst the *Persons*, a certain *Order* or *Oeconomy*; such as in the Scripture we find assigned to them. But do not own the Distinction so great as to make them *Three Gods*.

And that also of *p.* 13, 14. where he argues, that Christ is indeed *God*, (not only a dignified Man:) *That God in Christ was tempted, suffered, and died; not Man only: That the Merits thereof are founded on the Godhead. In plain terms*, (saith he) *if Christ were only a Man, extraordinarily assisted by God, and thereupon merited by his Sufferings and Death: 'twas the Man redeemed us by His Blood, and not God.* And *p.* 16. the like from *Rom.* 9. 5. *Of whom, as concerning the Flesh, Christ came; who Is over all; God Blessed for ever.* And asks, *If I even knew an Unitarian, especially an* Arian, *deny him that Character?* And from Heb. 1. 8. *To the Son he saith, Thy Throne, O God, endureth for ever; a Scepter of Righteousness is the Scepter of thy Kingdom*, &c. He argues, That *it is not the Humanity of Christ that*

is

is here ſpoken of. For what! Is the Humanity of Chriſt called God? Is the Humanity preferred before Angels? Or did the Humanity frame the World? Indeed (he ſays) *they are apt to clog it with a Limitation,* (as not acknowledging him *Co-equal with the Father.*) *But under that reſtriction, they can be as liberal of the title of God to Chriſt as any Trinitarian whatever.* Where I take what he grants: And, as to the *Co-equality*, ſhall diſcourſe it afterwards.

More of this kind I ſhall have occaſion to mention afterward. Yet do not blame him for taking this advantage (of ſhifting the Perſon) where he ſees cauſe to *Grant* what was before *Denied.*

But our new Anſwerer hath yet another Art. When he ſeems to cite what I ſay; he takes the liberty very often to vary therein (according as he thinks fit) both from my Words, and from my Senſe. And therefore I deſire the Reader not to take all as Mine, which ſeems to be cited as ſuch; but ſo much only as he finds to be truly cited. It would be too long to mention all the places where I am ſo uſed. I ſhall only give inſtance in ſome of them.

He tells us, *pag.* 4. *That I indeavour to illuſtrate the Trinity by an Example in a Cube,* or Die: and ſo far he ſays true. But not ſo in what follows, *where three ſides, he ſays, make one Cube; and which Cube, he ſays, is not to be made without all the three ſides.* But certainly he can no where find theſe to be my Words. I con-

ſeſs

ſeſs I am no great Gameſter at that Sport: but I always thought (till now) that a *Die* had *ſix ſides*, and not only *three*. I have ſaid indeed, that *in a Cube*, or Die, there be *three Dimenſions*, (*Length*, *Breadth*, *and Thickneſs*;) But I never called theſe, *the three ſides of a Cube*; nor have I any where ſaid, that *a Cube hath but three ſides*.

I am repreſented, *pag.* 5, 6, 7, 8. as maintaining *three perſonal Gods*. But he knows very well this is not my Language; but, that *the three Perſons* are *One God*; not *three Gods*, nor a *Council of Gods*, as he calls it.

So, where *he would ask the Doctor*, p. 17. *Whether theſe two Gods, to wit, the Father and the Word, be one.* He knows my Anſwer muſt be, that *theſe two*, (not, *theſe two Gods*,) are *one God*. And that I do no where call them *two Gods*, but *one and the ſame God*; according to that of Chriſt himſelf; *I and the Father are One*.

So, where he talks of *adding ſeveral Perſons to our one God*, pag. 3, 8. For he knows, that is not my Language, but theſe three *Are* God; not that they are *Added to* God: much leſs that *Bacchus* and *Venus*, &c. may be thruſt into the number. And *p.* 8. *one of your Gods*: We have but *One* God. 'Tis He and his *Arian*, that own *two Gods*, p. 17. Not we.

Another there is which runs through moſt part of his whole Diſcourſe; wherein he willfully miſtakes the ſtate of the Queſtion: And then, what

is

is brought to prove one thing, he miſ-applies as brought to prove another; And then makes a great out-cry, that it doth not prove, what it was never brought to prove. And this he calls *croſs purpoſes*. He knows very well, that the queſtion was by me clearly ſtated (not as to the whole Doctrine of the Trinity at large, but) as to the *Poſſibility*. That (whatever the *Socinians* pretend) there is no *Impoſſibility*, *Non-ſenſe*, or *Inconſiſtence with Reaſon*, that *three ſomewhats* (which we call *Perſons*) may be *One God*. And this he owns to be the ſtate of the Queſtion, p. 1. *to prove the ſame agreeable to the common notions of humane Reaſon*. And it is done by ſhewing that, *according to the common notions of humane Reaſon*, nothing is more common than that what in one conſideration are *Three*, or Many, is yet in another conſideration but *One*. Thus in *one Cube* there be *three Dimenſions*; length, breadth, and thickneſs. So the *Underſtanding*, *Will*, and *Memory*, in *one Soul*. So the νοερὸν, βουλευτικὸν, and πρακτικὸν, a Power to *Know*, to *Will*, and to *Doe*, in the ſame *Intelligent Agent*; and the like. 'Tis therefore not *Inconſiſtent with Reaſon* (and this Anſwerer doth allow it) for *one to be three*; nor is it *Non-ſenſe* to ſay, *theſe three are one*; or *I and the Father are One*; or that *three ſomewhats* may be *One God*. The former Anſwerer complains of theſe *Reſemblances*, as *impoſſible to be apprehended by the common people*; and deſires *ſome more Familiar Parallel* (than that of a Cube, or Die) that the *Tankard-bearer* may

may apprehend (in his p. 8, 9.) Yet I believe his *Tankard-bearer* is not so dull of apprehension, as he would have us think. For if he have ever *seen a Die* (as most of them have,) or shall now be *shewed* one, he may be able to *apprehend*, (without a *Metaphysick*, or *Mathematick Lecture*) That in a *Die*, there is *length, breadth, and thickness*, (and that it is *as broad as it is long*, and *as thick* as either;) and yet *it is not three Dice, but one Die.* However, to gratify his request, I have given him some other; as that the same *Man*, may have *three Dignities*, or *three Kingdoms*, and sustain *three Persons*; or *three Relations*, without thereby becoming *three Men*; with other like. With this, our new Answerer is not pleased. He is *Ashamed*, he doth *Blush for me*, &c. (How much am I obliged for this his great *Compassion*!) But all this is but *Banter*, (it is not *Argument*,) and no sober Man will be more of his Opinion for this Language: And much less for that of St. *John's writing Non-sense*, of a *lying Revelation*, of a *three-headed Monster*, (p. 3, 5. and other such Indecent Language of *God* and the *Scripture*. But, why so displeased with these Simile's? These are *too mean*, too *familiar*; He expected somewhat *higher*, somewhat more *distinct*, p. 5. (I see it is as hard a matter to please my *two Answerers*, as to serve *two Masters*. The one complains my Simile's are *not familiar enough*; the other that they are *too familiar*; he expected somewhat more sublime.) These do not prove, that a

Trinity in Unity is necessary to the perfection of the Godhead, p. 6. True: *These alone* do not prove that *there is a Trinity in Unity in the Godhead*; much less do they prove, that a Trinity in Unity is *necessary to the perfection of the Godhead*. Nor were they brought to prove it. They were brought to prove, There is no *Inconsistence*, but that there *may be* a Trinity in the Unity of the Godhead. And if they prove thus much, (he perhaps may have cause to be Ashamed, but) I see no reason why I should be Ashamed, (or any one *for me*.) Now, that they prove thus much; he hath already granted, *That a thing may be one and three*, in divers respects; And that *'tis no contradiction, to hold, that there May be Three Persons in God*. They have proved therefore, what they were brought to prove. But, says he, p. 5. *Our Debate is not, Whether there May be three Persons in God*. Yes; our Debate is, *whether there May be*. Not, *whether there Be*. And he knows the Question was so stated by me; and so acknowledg'd by himself; upon this *single point*, whether there be any *Impossibility in it*. (And so owned by himself, p. 1.) not whether *it be so* (for this, I had before said, was not to be argued upon the Topick of *Reason* alone;) but whether *it be agreeable to the common notions of Humane Reason*, that it *May be so*. And if this were the Question, (as he owns;) and this be proved (as he owns also;) Then I have proved, what I undertook to prove. And have no reason to be *Ashamed*, either of *the Undertaking*,

dertaking, or of the *Proof*. 'Tis our new Answerer (who doth wittingly and willingly misstate the Question) that is at *cross purposes*; while he applies those Arguments to one point, which he knows were brought to prove another, (which point himself grants to be proved; *He cannot say, there is a Contradiction in it*, pag. 6.) and then complains, that they (alone) do not prove what they were never brought to prove.

Of like nature is that other point; where he tells us, that we do now *venture*, to prove it to be *agreeable to the common notions of humane Reason*; that is, *not Inconsistent with it*. And we do so. But he would have it thought, that it is *but now of late* that any have *presumed to this confidence*, pag. 1, 2. and would have us *content, modestly to acknowledge it a meer mystery*; *and to rely upon the Authority of the Church, and Tradition*; without pretending, that it is *agreeable to Reason*. Now, that there is in it a *Mystery*, we readily grant, (and so there is in the whole Doctrine of our *Redemption*; *God manifested in the Flesh*, &c. 1 Tim. 3. 16.) as that which, without *Revelation*, we could not have found out by meer Reason; And, that it is *above Reason*, (that is, *more* than what *Reason alone* could have taught us:) But not that it is *Against Reason*, or *Inconsistent* with it. This is not the Doctrine of the Trinitarians; nor ever was that I know of. Nor is it *Tradition* only, or the *Church's Authority*; but the *Authority of Scripture* that we rely

upon: which is a *True*, not a *lying Revelation*. Nor is it (as he pretends) a new Doctrine, *not raised till several hundred years after Christ*, (as if the Doctrine were to be dated from the time of penning the *Athanasian* Creed;) but (as old at least as the New Testament;) and never contested (that I know of) till *several hundred years after Christ*, when the *Arians* arose. But here again my Answerers are not agreed: (So hard it is to please them both;) While one complains, *'tis but of late*; the other tells me, *'tis old-fashioned*, (in his p. 9. *Thus Dr. Wallis may see, that his Notions concerning the Trinity are old-fashioned; not of a new mode.*) And truly I take him to be more in the right; that 'tis not a *new quirk*, but *old-fashioned Doctrine*; and I like it never the worse for being so. As to what I have said of *Job* 19. 26. it is more than *Forty* years, (and well towards *Fifty*,) since I first Preached it in *London*, on that Text, (as I have since done, there and elsewhere, more than once;) and I did not then call it to be New, but what I had been always Taught. And as to that of *the three dimensions in a Cube*, it is *Forty* years or more, since I first discoursed it at *Oxford*, with Dr. *Ward*, then *Astronomy Professor* there, and since Bishop of *Salisbury*; And as to the Doctrine in general, (of *Three Persons in One God*,) it is no Newer than the New Testament. But here again our Answerer forsakes the Question. For the Question is not, Whether it be a New, or Old *Adventure*; but whether

ther it be *Inconsistent with Reason*, that *Three May be One*: or (as he words it, *p.* 3.) that *a Trinity in Unity is absurd.*

Another piece of the same Art it is, where my word of *Personality* is by him changed for *Personation*, *p.* 5, 6. For which I would not have quarrelled with him, if by changing the *Word*, he had not meant to change the *Sense* also. For to *personate a Man*, (he tells us, *p.* 6.) *is but to compose ones Actions in Likeness of him*; and that *one cannot personate three together, but one after another*. But my *Personality* (he knows) is more than this *Personation*. It is not only *Acting* a Person, but *Being* a Person. A Man may successively *Personate*, or *Act the Person* of, a *King*, and a *Father*; without *being* either This or That: But when the same Man *IS* both a King and a Father (which he may be at the same time, as well as successively,) this is more than only to *Act* them. And if by *Personation* he mean no more than *Acting a Person*, I wonder how he can tell us, *p.* 5. That *Personation is the greatest Perfection of Being*; and that *he never could apprehend any other real Unity but Personation*. What? *No real Unity but acting a Person by imitation*? Sure there is. The Bottom, and Top, and Middle of a Mountain, are *one Mountain*: Yet I do not take *Mount Atlas* to be a *Person*, or to *Act* a person; much less to become One Mountain by *Personation*, or *Acting a Person*.

Of like nature is it, where (to do me a kindness)

he

he will ſtate my Cube more to my purpoſe; p. 5. (meaning the contrary.) But how? In a *Marble Cube* may be two Accidents, *Hardneſs*, and *Coldneſs*. There may be ſo. But what then? *Then*, (he ſays,) *there are Three Cubes more for me.* He would have it thought, I ſuppoſe, that I had before diſcourſed of *Three Cubes* (whereas I ſpoke but of *One Cube*, under *three Dimenſions*;) and he will now help me to *another Three*. But he is out again. For the *Cold* Cube, the *Hard* Cube, and the *Marble* Cube, are but *One* Cube, not *Three Cubes*. 'Tis the *ſame Cube* that is *Cold*, and *Hard*, and *Marble*. It would have been much the ſame, if, inſtead of a *Cube*, he had taken a Marble *Bowl*, or *Ball*; and then told me, 'Tis *Cold*, and *Hard*, and *Round*. True. And yet it is but *One Bowl*, not *Three Bowls*: *One Ball*, not *Three Balls*. And what is there in all this of *Inconſiſtent Abſurdity*? It ſeems to me very *Conſiſtent*; not *Abſurd*: and it ſuits my Notion very well.

But, ſays he, p. 5. *not to ſuppoſe the ſimile altogether impertinent*, (very well!) yet *it is in our caſe*. Why in our caſe? *For our Debate* (he ſays) *is not, whether there May not be three perſons in God.* Yes: That is our Debate: And the true ſtate of the Queſtion. All his other Excurſions are beſide the Queſtion.

But *the ſimile*, though not impertinent, *is yet* (he ſays) *moſt Abſurd*, becauſe *not Adequate*; and *it is a general rule with him* (p. 6.) *where he brings a ſimile, to have it Adequate, that it may really prove the matter deſigned.*

ſigned. Now that my Simile's are not *Adequate* (ſo as to prove all that is to be ſaid of God, or the Bleſſed Trinity) I had told him at firſt, and more than once; and that they were not *intended* ſo to be; (and I tell him now, that I did purpoſely make choice of ſuch as were a great way off, that it might not ſeem as if I would have them thought to be *Adequate*, as to all that is to be ſaid of the Trinity.) And as to the *Rule* he goes by; perhaps it may be his Method, where much is to be proved, to prove it all at once; (and take all Arguments to be *Abſurd*, which do not at once prove All.) But we who are *converſant in Cubes and Demonſtrations* (as he phraſeth it) think fit ſometimes to uſe another Method: and, where much is to be proved, to proceed by ſteps. We firſt propoſe one thing, and prove that: then another, and prove that: and ſo on. And if what be brought to prove the firſt ſtep, do prove what it is brought to prove; we do not ſay, The Argument is *Abſurd*, becauſe it doth not prove all at once: But, That it is a *Good* Argument *ſo far*. And, I think, (if he will here give me leave to uſe a *Simile* which is not *Adequate*,) it is a Method uſed by other Men, as well as *Mathematicians*. For, if a Man be to mount a pair of *Stairs*; we do not ſay, The firſt ſtep is *Abſurd*, becauſe that alone doth not bring him to the *Top*: or, if to go a *Journey*, That the firſt ſtep is *Abſurd*, becauſe it doth not bring him to his Journeys *End*: But the firſt ſtep brings him ſo Far;

and

and the ſecond, ſomewhat farther; and ſo on, till (ſtep by ſtep) he comes to the *Top*, or to his Journeys *End*. Now, there being divers Points concerned in the Doctrine of the Trinity; I ſtated my Queſtion, not ſo as to prove all at once; but *ſingled* out this one Point, That *it is not Inconſiſtent with Reaſon* (or, to uſe his own words; *it is agreeable to the common Notions of humane Reaſoning*,) *That what in one conſideration are Three, May in another Conſideration be One*; and, that *there May be three ſomewhat's, which are one God*. But, whether indeed *there be ſo*, is Another ſtep; and whether theſe *ſomewhat's* may fitly be called *Perſons*, is yet Another. Now, if I have made good my firſt ſtep; my *Argument* or *Simile*, is not only *not altogether impertinent*, but neither is it *moſt Abſurd*, yea *not Abſurd* at all; becauſe it proves what it was brought to prove. And, that ſo it doth, himſelf allows; and tells us plainly, p. 3. *He cannot ſay, there is a Contradiction, in holding, that there May be Three Perſons in God.* Ὅπερ ἔδει δεῖξαι.

But I find, he would fain be upon another Point, p. 4. and draw me to it. A Point not to be argued upon the Topick of *Reaſon* only, (for, Reaſon alone, can go no further than to prove it *Poſſible*, or *not Inconſiſtent*;) but to be argued from *Scripture*, and *Divine Revelations*, whether indeed *there are* three *ſomewhats* (which we call *Perſons*) that are but *One God*.

But this, I have told him already, is *Beſide the Queſtion*

Queſtion which I undertook. And, in this, it is He that is the *Aggreſſor*, not I: and I only upon the *Defence*. Yet, becauſe he is ſo deſirous of it, I am content to go ſomewhat out of my way, to wait on him; and to hear what he hath to ſay, why we ſhould think *that Is not*, which he confeſſeth *May be* without any *Contradiction* to natural *Reaſon*. And I ſhall take notice as I go along, what it is wherein we Agree, as well as wherein we Differ: That ſo we may not quarrel about what is Agreed between us.

He begins with the *Firſt Commandment*, p. 1, 2, 3, 4. And ſeems mightily to *dread the Guilt of Idolatry*, in admitting *more Gods than one*: (*our Caſe is, we are afraid of Idolatry*, p. 9.) contrary to this Commandment, of having *no other God*. (And ſo I would have him be. But we ſhall find this *Fear* will be over with him by and by.) *What* (ſays he) *was that Commandment made for? What! to prevent Polytheiſm. Why, how is that to be done? By denying many Gods. If it be not made to deny perſonal Gods, 'tis made to no purpoſe.* And ſoon after (with ſome indignation.) *What! is the Divinity of Chriſt implied in the New Teſtament? 'tis denied in the Firſt Commandment.* And, *p.* 9. *Pray, what Scripture ſhall we regard, in competition with this Commandment, written by the Finger of God, and one of the only Precepts he himſelf immediately delivered?*

Now I am ſo far from diſliking his Zeal for the Firſt Commandment; that I do perfectly agree

 with

with what I find in that Commandment; *I am the Lord Thy God* (the Lord God of *Israel*) *Thou shalt have No other God but Me.* (And this I shall desire Him to remember by and by.) He may add that of *Deut. 6, 7.* (for in this I agree also) *Hear, O Israel, the Lord our God* (the Lord God of *Israel*) *is one Lord.* And that of *Mat. 4. 10. Thou shalt worship the Lord Thy God* (the Lord God of *Israel*,) *and Him only shalt thou serve.* And that of 1 Cor. 8. 6. *To us there is but One God.* (And as many more places, as he pleases, to that purpose.) And from all these I do agree, that we are to have but *one God* and *no more*; (not *two Gods.*) No *other* God than *the Lord God of Israel*: That we are to Worship *Him* alone, and *none else*; (not *Sathan*, not *the god of Ekron*, not any God, or Man, or Angel, who is not *the Lord God of Israel.*) For all this I grant to be there fully Taught. And I am willing to put as great weight upon this *solemn set Precept of the First Commandment*, as he doth, (and perhaps more.) *He would have us shew* (if we can) p. 9. *where this Commandment is Abrogated.* I say, No where. It was never *Abrogated*: Never *Repealed*: It remains (I grant) still in its full force. And therefore we own no *other* God, but *the Lord God of Israel.* And this *Lord God of Israel*, we say is *One Lord*, *One God*, and no more Gods than *One.* We say indeed, there is a *Wise* God, a *Powerful* God, an *Almighty* God, an *Eternal* God, a *Just* God, a *Merciful* God, God the *Creator*, God the *Redeemer*, God the *Sanctifier*; a God who

who in the beginning created the heaven and the earth, a God who *in the beginning laid the foundation of the Earth, and the Heavens are the work of his hands*, a God of *Abraham*, a God of *Isaac*, a God of *Jacob*, a God *who brought the Children of Israel out of* Egypt, a God who brought them *out of the North Country*, a God who *is our Mighty Redeemer*, a God who is *a Saviour of all that trust in him*, a God who doth *create in us a clean heart, and doth renew a right spirit within us*, a God who *gives us a heart of Flesh*, a God who *gives us a New Heart*, who *putteth his Fear in our Hearts*, who *writes his Law in our inward parts*, a God who *searcheth the Heart and trieth the Reins*, a God who *hath Visited and Redeemed his People, and hath raised up a mighty Salvation for us.* But we say, *the Lord God of Israel* is all this; and, in being all this, he is but *One God*; and, that there is *no other God but One.* And we grant, that whoever owns any *other* God as a *true God*, or Worships a *false God*, breaks this Commandment. I do not know what he would have us *Grant* more upon this Commandment. I wish He do not think we have *Granted too much.*

He says, p. 3. *We vitiate this Commandment, by bringing in New persons, by Adding several Persons to our One God.* No: We *Add no Persons to our God*; We say, that *God the Creator, God the Redeemer, God the Sanctifier*, (or, in other words, *the Father, Son, and Holy-Ghost*,) *ARE* this One God; not *added to him.* Nor are they *new Persons added to* God; but, *are God*; and *ever were so.*

He would have us think, *p.* 17. that the *Father only*, (and not the *Son*, or *Holy Ghost*) is the *Only true God*; because of *Joh.* 17. 3. The words are these, *This is Life Eternal, to know Thee* (not *only Thee*) *the only True God* (to be that God, beside which there is no other *true God*,) *and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent.* And we say the same that is here said. The *Father is the only True God* (the Lord God of *Israel*, beside whom there is no other *true God*;) The *Son* is also, not *another* God, (as the *Arians* say, and this Answerer, *p.* 17.) but the same *only true God* (the Lord God of *Israel*; and he is expressly so called, *Luk.* 1. 16, 17.) And the *Holy Ghost* likewise, (for *these Three are One*, 1 *Joh.* 5. 7.) And the words (without any force put upon them) may be thus read, *To know Thee (and whom thou hast sent, Jesus Christ) to be the only True God.* For the word *only* is not a restrictive to *Thee*, but to *the True God.* And this is not only a *new Querk or Criticism* (which is the only Answer he gives to this Defence,) but is the true sense of the place. For the same Writer doth (in another place) say the *very same* thing of God *the Son*, 1 Joh. 5. 20. *We are in him that is True, even in his Son Jesus Christ; This is the True God, and Eternal Life.* Now if *Scripture must interpret Scripture*, (as he tells us, *p.* 16.) certainly S. *John* in his *Epistle* (1 Joh. 5. 20.) understood what himself said in his *Gospel* (Joh. 17. 3.) And that, what he said of the *Father's* being the *Only True God*, was not exclusive of the *Son*, to whom himself

ſelf gives the ſame Title, *This is the True God*, and this is *Eternal Life*. And this I think is a full Anſwer to what he would urge from this place; or from (what he joins with it) 1 *Cor.* 8. 4, 5, 6. *To us there is but One God.* Which is no more expreſs to his purpoſe, than This is: Nor doth he pretend that it is; but puts them both together, *p.* 17.

There is one place more, which comes under conſideration, which (becauſe he finds it pinch) he would fain ſhake off, *p.* 17. It is that of *Joh.* 1. 1, 2, 10, 14. *In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God. The World was made by him; All things were made by him; And without him was not any thing made which was made; And the Word was made Fleſh, and dwelt amongſt us.* The former Anſwerer would fain ſhuffle off this place (in his *p.* 9.) upon one of theſe three Points; (for, otherwiſe, he grants, *it is for our purpoſe*;) either that by *the Word* is not meant *Chriſt*; or, by *God*, not the *True God*; or elſe that S. *John writes Non-ſenſe*. Now the laſt of the Three, I ſuppoſe our New Anſwerer will not ſay; becauſe he pretends a great Reverence for *Scriptures*. The firſt he Quits; and doth admit (according to the *Arian* ſenſe, which he looks upon as more defenſible than that of the *Socinians*) that, by *the Word*, is here meant the *Perſon of Chriſt* (who was afterward incarnate of the Virgin *Mary*;) and that he was *pre-exiſtent* to his Incarnation; as *by whom the World was made*, at leſt as *by an Inſtrument*.

And

And that he was *with God* (the True God) at least *in the beginning of the World* (if not sooner;) and that *he was God.*

All the doubt is, whether these *Two Gods* (for so he calls them) *to wit the Father and the Word,* be *One,* p. 17.

Now, if he *be God*; he must be either a *True God,* or a *False* God. That he is a *False God,* methinks they should not say. And, if he be a *True God,* he must be the same God with the Father; who is *the ONLY True God,* Joh. 17. 3.

That he is to be *Worshipped* with Religious Worship, both the *Arians* and the *Socinians* do allow. And if he *be God* (as the *Arians* and this Answerer do affirm;) this *Worship,* must be *Divine Worship.* And he must be then the *Lord God of Israel*; or else they break that Precept, *Thou shalt Worship the Lord Thy God* (the Lord God of Israel *and Him ONLY shalt thou serve,* Mat. 4. 10.

If he be *the Lord God of Israel*, but not *the same* Lord God of *Israel*: How doth this agree with that, *Deut. 6. 4. Hear, O Israel) the Lord Our God is One Lord?*

And if he be *another* God (whether True or False) then do they break the Great and *First* Commandment, *Thou shalt have No Other God but me*; (no other God, True or False, Great or Little, Equal or Unequal; but the *Lord God of Israel.*) On which Commandment this Answerer doth (deservedly) lay so

great

great a ſtreſs; as we heard before. *What was it made for, if not to prevent Polytheiſm? How ſhall it be done, but by denying many Gods? If not to deny Perſonal Gods; it is made to no purpoſe. How is it conſiſtent with that Firſt Commandment, (that ſolemn and ſet Precept of the Firſt Commandment, that was delivered by God himſelf; written by the Finger of God; and never Abrogated;) to bring in New Perſons; to Add Perſons* (one or more) *to this Only God, though particularly prohibited, and not Break it? What! Is the Divinity of Chriſt implied in the New Teſtament? It is denied in the Firſt Commandment* (if he be not the ſame God who is there meant:) *And Pray, what Scripture ſhall we regard in competition with this Commandment?* With more to the ſame purpoſe.

Whether he will make uſe of the Popiſh diſtinction of *Latria* and *Doulia*, (for his *Two Gods*, not *Co-equal*) I cannot tell. But the Commandment ſays expreſly, *Thou ſhalt have NO OTHER God, but Me*, Equal or Unequal.

Nor doth this Error end here (as he proceeds:) *For our Adverſaries are not always ſo lucky as to ſee Conſequences. For ſhould ſome Revelation* (*ſuch as*, he ſays, *is not impoſſible*) *deify more Men than ever the Heathen did; here's no fence left.* (Here's room enough to *thruſt in* his *Jupiter*, *Bacchus*, *Venus*, &c. of which he tells us, p. 8.) *And 'tis in vain* (he tells us) *in ſuch a caſe, to pretend that the number would be of offence to us: For if we conſider aright, there is no more reaſon for one number than another.* And he *thinks*, that if there be *more*

than

than one, it is *more honourable* they ſhould be *Infinites*; becauſe *all between one and infinite, is Imperfect*. With much more of like nature. Of all which I know not what better to think, than that he had *forgot* all this, when afterwards (at *p.* 17.) he will have *theſe two Gods* (as he calls them) *to wit, the Father and the Word*, not to be *One*, but *Two and Separate*.

Nor will it excuſe the matter to ſay, That this *Other* God, is not *Co-equal* with the Father. For, at this rate, the *Polytheiſm*, or *many Gods* of the Heathen, would be excuſed, as out of the reach of this Commandment. For they did not make All their Gods *Co-equal* to their great *Jupiter* (nor perhaps any of them Equal to *Our God*.) But *Jupiter* was their *God Paramount*, and the reſt were either *Middling* Gods, or *Leſſer* Gods. But yet this did not excuſe them from *Polytheiſm* and *Idolatry*, within the reach of the *Firſt Commandment*. For that Commandment (that *Unrepealed Law*) forbids *All other* Gods, whether Equal or Unequal: The *Leeks and Onions in* Egypt (which are ſaid to have been there Worſhipped) as well as the *Calves at* Dan *and* Bethel. Nor is it leſs *Idolatry*, nor leſs within the reach of *this Commandment*, to Worſhip *the god of* Ekron, becauſe not *Co-equal* to *the God of* Iſrael.

We therefore chuſe to ſay, That Chriſt is indeed *God* (as he is expreſly called, *Joh.* 1. 1. *The Word was with God, and the Word was God*; and *Hebr.* 1. 8. *Thy Throne, O God, endureth for ever*: And in many other places:)

places:) and not only *a Man, extraordinarily Assisted by God*, (as this Answerer grants also, at *p.* 14.) That *he was in the Beginning*, and *in the Beginning was with God*; Joh. 1. 1, 2. (and therefore was *pre-existent* before his *Incarnation*; and did not then *Begin to Be*.) That *he was in the Beginning, and All things were made by Him, and without him was not any thing made that was made; that the World was made by Him*; Joh. 1. 1. 10. (and is therefore the *same God*, who *in the beginning Created the Heaven and the Earth*, Gen. 1. 1.) That *of Him it is said, Thou, Lord, in the beginning hast laid the foundation of the Earth, and the Heavens are the Works of Thy hands*, Heb. 1. 8, 10. cited out of *Psal.* 102. 25. (and is therefore *the same God*, to whom that long Prayer, *Psal.* 102. was made; and of whom so many great things are there said; and which cannot belong to any but the Supreme God:) And no doubt but, when this was there said by the Psalmist, he meant it of that *God*, who *in the beginning created the Heaven and the Earth*, Gen. 1. 1. That he is ὁ ὢν ἐπὶ πάντων, *the Being above All things* (or the *Supreme Being*,) *God Blessed for ever* (or, *the Ever-blessed God*) Rom. 9. 5. (which are Titles too High for any lower than the *Supreme God*.) That what is said of *God* indefinitely (as contra-distinguished from Christ in particular) Rev. 1. 4. ἀπὸ τοῦ ὢν, καὶ ὁ ἦν, καὶ ὁ ἐρχόμενος, *From him which Is, and which Was, and which is to Come* (or *which Shall be*) *and from Jesus Christ*, &c.; is particularly applied to *Jesus*

Christ as his Character, *Ver.* 8. *I am* Alpha *and* Omega, *the Beginning and the Ending, saith the Lord,* (he *that Liveth, and was Dead, and Liveth for evermore,* Ver. 18.) *which Is, and Was, and is to Come, the Almighty.* That he is *the True God,* 1 Joh. 5. 20. (and therefore *the same God with the Father;* who is *the Only True God,* Joh. 17. 3. and no other *True God* but what he is.) That *He and the Father are one,* Joh. 10. 30. That *the Father, and the Word, and the Spirit, these Three are One,* 1 Joh. 5. 7. And Christ, not another God, but the same God, *manifested in the Flesh, justified in the Spirit, seen of Angels, preached unto the Gentiles, believed on in the World, received up into Glory,* 1 Tim. 3. 16.

Now I know not well, what could be said more (at least, what more need be said) to make the Point clear: Or, what Character he can reasonably desire more, by which to describe the Almighty Supreme God; and the same God with the Father. He is *God*; the *True God*; the *Only true God,* (for there can be but One God, that is *the Only true God*;) *One with the Father*; *One with the Father and Holy-Ghost*; the *Eternal* God, (who *Is, and Was, and Shall be*; who, *when the Heavens and the Earth shall wax old as a Garment, He is the same and his years shall not fail*;) the *Almighty*; the *Mighty God*; the *Eternal Father*; the God who *in the beginning made the World*; who *made All things*; and *without whom not any thing was made that was made*; who *in the beginning laid the foundation of the Earth, and the Heavens are the works of his hands*; who

is

is the *Son of God*, the *Begotten of the Father*; the *Only-begotten of the Father*, (and therefore *of the same Nature* with the Father, however not the same *Person*, or not under that Consideration.) Nor can he say, This is *Impossible*, a *Contradiction*, or *Inconsistent with Reason*, and that therefore, though the *Words* be *Clear and Plain*, yet we must seek out some *Other sence* to be *Forced* upon them: For this Point is already Gained; and he doth Confess it, *p.* 3. that *there is no Contradiction, in holding that there may be Three Persons in God.* And, if there be *no Contradiction* in it, why should we be afraid to say, what in Scripture is said so plainly? Or, why should we set up *Two Gods* where *One* will serve, and when the Scripture says, *There is but One*?

He'll say perhaps, *God made the World by Christ.* And we say so too. But not as by a *Tool* or *Instrument*, (as he would have it, *p.* 17.) but rather as by his *Power* or *Wisdom.* But the Power and Wisdom of God, are not Things diverse from God himself; but *are Himself.* (Much less are they *different Gods* from God himself.) And, even amongst us, the Power and Wisdom of a Man, are not *Things* distinct from the Man; (in that sense wherein the Words *Thing* and *Mode* are contra-distinguished;) much less are they distinct *Men* from the *Man* whose *Power and Wisdom* they are. The *Man* and his *Wisdom*; the *Man* and his *Power*, are not distinguished *ut res & res*, (as the Schools speak) but *ut res & modus.* And *Power* and

Wisdom (in the same Man) *ut modus & modus*. For though a *Man* may subsist without *Wisdom* (but God cannot;) yet *Wisdom* cannot subsist without *somewhat that is Wise*; nor *This Man's Wisdom* without the *Man*; and therefore *this Wisdom* (according to the School-distinction) must be *Modus*, and not *Res*. (And the like of *Power*.) So that if we say, that *Christ* is *the Power of God*, or *the Wisdom of God* (as he is called 1 Cor. 1. 24.) and that *God, by his Power and Wisdom, made the World*; it doth not follow, that this *Power*, or *Wisdom of God*, is another *God* from *God himself*: but *God and his Wisdom*, or *God and his Power*, is *God himself*. Consonant to this it is, where it is said, Col. 2. 3. *In him are hid all the treasures of Wisdom and Knowledge*. And perhaps it is this Divine *Wisdom*, who tells us, Prov. 8. 22, 23, 27. *The Lord possessed Me in the Beginning of his ways; I was from Everlasting, from the beginning; When he prepared the Heavens, I was there*; and much more to the same purpose. So the *Holy Ghost* is called the *Power of God*, Luk. 1. 35. *The Holy Ghost shall come upon Thee, and the Power of the Highest shall over-shadow Thee*. Now shall we say, Because *God is Wise in heart, and Mighty in Strength*, Job 9. 4. or Because *by his Wisdom and Power he made the World*; Therefore his Wisdom and his Power are distinct Gods from himself? Or if we should say, that God as the *Fountain of Being*, may be called the *Father*; and the same God, as the *Fountain of Wisdom*, be called the *Son*; and, as the *Fountain of Power*, be called

the

the *Holy-Ghost*: There is nothing of this that is *Inconsistent with Reason*, but very *Agreeable with the common Notions of Humane Reasoning*; and yet all these (however under divers Considerations) are but *One God*. But here I must caution again (for I find people are willing to Mistake, or mis-apply what I say.) That I do not set down this as the *Adequate* Distinction between the Three Persons (for this I do not pretend throughly to Understand;) but only that it is not *Inconsistent with Reason*, that it *May be* so: And that there is no necessity, upon this account, to set up *Another God*.

Or we may say (much to the same purpose) that *God* by his *Word*, and *Spirit*, made *the World*; and yet that his *Word*, and his *Spirit*, are not therefore *Distinct Gods* from *Himself*. And we have them all mentioned in the Story of the Creation. *God created the Heaven and the Earth*, Gen. 1. 1. *The* SPIRIT *of God moved upon the face of the waters*, ver. 2. And *God* SAID, (or spake the *Word*) *Let there be Light*, &c. Ver. 3, 6, 9, 11, 14, 20, 24. And ver. 26. *Let* US *make Man*. And *Psal.* 33. 6, 9. *By the* WORD *of the Lord were the Heavens made, and all the Host of them by the* SPIRIT, *or* BREATH *of his Mouth*: *He* SPAKE *and it was done, He Commanded and it stood fast*. (And to the like purpose, *Psal.* 148. 5. *Job* 26. 13.) Yet are they not *Three Gods*; but rather *Three somewhats* which are but *One God*.

I have insisted the longer on this; because I do

not

not know, but that (through the Grace of God) such a discourse as this, may have a like effect on him (or some of his Party) as that of *Wittichius* had on his Friend *Sandius*. And I have Argued it *Calmly*. I have used no scurrilous Language; nor given any Reproachful terms. I do not oppress him with the Authority of *Fathers*, or *Councils*; but with *Scripture* only, and Plain *Reason*. And it seems to me so *clear*, that if they cannot *see* it; it is from some other reason than from *want of Clearness*.

As to what I have said for Explication of the *Athanasian* Creed (though I cannot expect he should approve of that Creed, while he retains his Opinion,) I do not find that he takes any great Exceptions to what I say of it.

He doth not like the Words *Trinity in Unity*, as *Foreign and Unscriptural*, p. 19. He may (if that will please him better) put it into plainer English, and call it *Three in One*; and then the *Words* are *Scriptural*. *These Three are One*.

The *Possibility* of *God's being Incarnate*, he doth not Deny. Only he likes the *Arian* Incarnation better than Ours.

He seems well pleased, p. 19, 20. That I do not positively Affirm, *This Creed to be written by Athanasius*. That I do not *Anathematize the Greek Church*. That I do not *Damn all Children, Fools, Madmen, and all before Christ*; (as, he tells us, some *Rigid Trinitarians*, I know not who, *have done too often*.) That I own

own the word *Person* to be but *Metaphorical*, (which at *p.* 7. he did not like:) which, I will not disoblige him, by Unsaying.

Where it is that I have *blamed the Fathers*, I do not remember. For I think the Fathers do concur in this; That there is a *Distinction* between *the Three* (which we call) *Persons*, greater than that between the *Divine Attributes*; but *not such* as to make them *Three Gods*: And, that by calling them *Persons*, they mean no more. And I say the same.

I shall conclude with this Observation upon the whole. He was at the Beginning of his Discourse, a Direct *Socinian*; *Dreading the guilt of Idolatry in having more Gods than One*; as contrary to *the First Commandment*: (And therein I agree with him:) But *Denied* the *Divinity of Christ*; as the *Socinians* do. And thus he continues till toward the end of *p.* 10. But then begins (silently) to tack about; and, after a while, doth with as much earnestness *Affirm* the Divinity of Christ, as he had before *Denied* it; that Christ was God from the Beginning, before the World was; that he was afterward Incarnate and became Man; and, as God and Man, Redeemed us, *&c.*) And here he is Orthodox again. But then tells us, that this *God* is not *the same God*, or *Co-equal* with the *Father*, but *another* God. And at length tells us plainly, that there are, at least, *Two Gods*, *to wit the Father and the Word*: (for now the Fear of having more Gods than One, is over with him:) and

and is by this time a perfect *Arian*. And he who, from a *Socinian*, is thus turn'd *Arian*, may at the next turn (for ought I know) turn *Orthodox*.

In order to which, I would advise him to keep to the sound part of his first Opinion, while he was a *Socinian*, namely, *That we ought to acknowledge and Worship but One God*: And the sound part of his second Opinion when he was turned *Arian*, namely, That Christ (*the Word*) was *God, from the Beginning*, (*before the World was*;) that he was afterwards *Incarnate*, and so became *God and Man*; that, as such, he *Suffered, Died*, and wrought out *our Redemption*; that *the Merits* of his *Sufferings are founded on his Godhead*; which otherwise would not have been meritorious, *if he were only a Man*, however *extraordinarily assisted by God*. And when he hath so joined these two together, as to make them Consistent, he will be therein *Orthodox*. And if, to these Two, he add a Third (which he owns also) namely, that *there is no Contradiction, in holding, there may be Three Persons in God*: he will then be able to Answer all the Cavils which either the *Arian* or the *Socinian* shall bring against it.

FINIS.

29134